DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 630 24 EA 004 235

AUTHOR	Woodring, Paul, Ed.
TITLE	Educational Personnel Development: Challenge of the Seventies. Report of a Conference for Chief State School Officers. (Palo Alto, California, July 30-August 7, 1970.)
INSTITUTION	Stanford Univ., Calif. Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.
BUREAU NO	BR-5-0252
PUB DATE	70
CONTRACT	OEC-6-10-078
GRANT	OEG-0-9-146003-2450-725
NOTE	49p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role; *Compensatory Education; Conferences; *Curriculum Development; Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Accountability; Educational Administration; Instructional Improvement; Performance Contracts; *School Personnel; *Staff Improvement; State Officials; Teacher Improvement; Teaching Quality

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the formal presentations and panel discussions of a conference on the current problems of educational personnel development. Chief education officers from 27 States attended the conference, as well as representatives from the U.S. Office of Education. Summaries of the 13 separate sessions are presented topically under (1) the administrator's role in school improvement, (2) accountability and performance contracting, (3) compensatory education for the disadvantaged, (4) getting and holding better teachers, and (5) curricular reform and improved instructional techniques. (RA)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 061630

Educational Personnel Development: Challenge of the Seventies

Report of a conference for
CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS
July 30-August 7, 1970

Sponsored by
STANFORD TEACHER LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE
and
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT
United States Office of Education

SC
RD
T

Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching

School of Education Stanford University

Educational Personnel Development: Challenge of the Seventies

Report of a conference for
CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

Sponsored by
STANFORD TEACHER LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE
an Affiliated Project of the
Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching
School of Education, Stanford University

and

TEACHER LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
United States Office of Education

Palo Alto, California
July 30-August 7, 1970

Paul Woodring
Conference Reporter

The conference reported herein was supported by funds made available to the Stanford Teacher Leadership Development Institute pursuant to Grant No. OEG-0-9-146003-2450-725 from the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development and to the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching under Contract No. OEC-6-10-078 with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Contents

Editor's Foreword: PAUL WOODRING	v
Introductory Remarks: ROBERT N. BUSH	1
Conference Résumé: PAUL WOODRING	6
The Administrator's Role in School Improvement	7
Accountability and Performance Contracting	9
Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged	11
Getting and Holding Better Teachers	14
Curricular Reform and Improved Instructional Techniques	20
Evaluation of the Conference	25
Responses of Conference Participants	25
Editorial Comments	28
Appendices	33
A. Council of Chief State School Officers (identifying those who attended the Conference)	33
B. Program of the Conference (listing speakers and program session leaders)	37
C. Evaluation Form	42

Editor's Foreword

Educators who have risen to the higher levels of administrative responsibility rarely have either the time or the inclination to return to the classroom as students. Many of them find too little time either to think deeply about the more basic problems of education or to keep up with the literature. For such administrators, conferences have become the major form of in-service education.

Of conferences there is no lack; any educational administrator who has risen above the level of obscurity finds himself invited to more than he has the time to accept. He must select, and if he chooses unwisely he may find that some of the speeches are dull while others lie outside his personal range of interest. If group discussions are substituted for speeches, he may find that some of the discussions are little more than an exchange of prejudices and that some of the discussants forget what topic is being discussed. Like a student in a classroom, he may hear a repetition of many things he already knows and jokes that he himself has told. And yet, because a conference is something more than a series of speeches and scheduled discussions, when the participant looks back upon the experience he may find that his horizons have been broadened, his circle of professional acquaintances enlarged, and his conception of his job expanded. At the very least, he is likely to find that he has learned about some new developments in education that give promise of improving his own schools. And if the conference was a good one, he may discover that he has been led to think more deeply about the meaning and purposes of education, and has gained a better understanding of his own role in the administrative process.

The Conference of Chief State School Officers described in this publication was exceptionally well planned and organized. Its planners, instead of relying exclusively on "name" speakers, sought out a number of younger and less well-known educators whose unique experiences gave promise that they might have something new and significant to report. Though such a procedure is risky—because the leaders are

likely to be younger and less experienced than the conference participants—if the selection is well made it gives freshness and vitality to a conference. Inevitably, some of those invited to take a leadership role in this conference were more effective than others, but each had something significant to contribute.

"Chief State School Officer" is a phrase made necessary by the fact that the administrative heads of education in the various states and territories have different titles. In the majority of the 50 states, they are called "Superintendent of Public Instruction," but in some they are called "Commissioner of Education," "Secretary of Education," or "Superintendent of Schools," while the Chief of West Virginia has the unique title, "Superintendent of Free Schools."

The powers of the Chief also differ from state to state. In some states he wields a considerable amount of control over all education, elementary and higher, public, private, and parochial. In others his authority is restricted to the public schools and in some is limited to elementary and secondary education. In some states the Chief has very little control over influential educators who, within their own realms, play a substantial role in determining the course of education.

The power of Chief State School Officers has been expanded in recent years by the fact that the increasing amounts of federal funds for education have been channeled through the state departments of education. It seems probable that their power will grow still greater as more federal funds are made available for education. Consequently, it is of the utmost importance that the men and women holding these posts be well informed and prepared to take a sophisticated view of the problems of education as a basis for the important decisions which they must make.

In at least one respect this report on a conference is unique—it includes a critical appraisal of the work of speakers and session leaders as well as of the work of the planners. All teachers have always been expected to evaluate the work of their pupils. In many schools students now evaluate their teachers, and in most schools administrators evaluate their teachers. But conference leaders and speakers have rarely been told whether or not their work has been effective. This, perhaps, is one reason why conferences have not improved greatly in quality over the years.

The evaluation of a conference, or of a conference speaker, obviously cannot be "objective"—it must consist of a distillation of subjective professional judgments. The planners of this conference were convinced that Chief State School Officers are well qualified to make such judgments and that their opinions should be heard and reported as a basis

for future planning. These opinions are summarized at the end of the the report, following a summary of the speeches and other presentations.

Paul Woodring
Distinguished Service Professor
Western Washington State College
Bellingham, Washington
Education Editor-at-Large, *Saturday Review*

Introductory Remarks: Challenge of the '70's in Educational Personnel Development

ROBERT N. BUSH, *Director*
Stanford Center for Research and Development
in Teaching (on leave)

It is my pleasant opportunity to have a place during this opening session of the conference to say a few words about the conference and those who made it possible. The chief persons are here at the head table, Byron Hansford and Don Davies. I don't know which one of them spoke of it first, but I'm certain that as soon as the idea emerged they both began talking simultaneously. The first knowledge about the possibilities of a summer meeting came through a long distance telephone call from Don Davies in Washington. Don asked if the Teacher Leadership Development Panel at Stanford would care to sponsor such a meeting. After discussing it with members of the Teacher Leadership Training Institute and my colleagues at the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching and in the School of Education, we concluded that it was an excellent idea, but the crucial question, as always, was who would do the work. We looked and found lurking in the background a "somewhat innocent"—I use the term advisedly—ex-Chief State School Officer in exile in graduate school, namely, Duane Mattheis. After a brief discussion of less than 15 minutes, he said that he would be willing to undertake the responsibility for organizing such a meeting. This happened in early February, and I promptly went to the hospital with a heart attack and have not been back since, leaving him with the entire job. This sounds as though it were not altogether a kind thing for me to do, and I agree. But it is not really as bad as it sounds, for I made one noble and constructive gesture. I left him Connie Kirby, and if you do not know her yet, you will before the conference is completed, and you will learn how great was the service I performed for Duane. I wish

at this point to thank Duane and Connie, upon whom the main burden of planning and arranging this conference has fallen, for their excellent work. I have studied the program, as I am sure you have by now, and I know that you will agree with me that an excellent series of sessions is in store during the week.

I had originally intended to take a large hand in shaping the conference but fate intervened. Indeed, I had hoped to make not one but several speeches. The planners during the last month cut me down to one speech, and now they have me reduced to making some introductory remarks at this initial session and to introducing Don Davies. It is a privilege to introduce him; I assure you that he will be the speaker of the evening, but I wish to make a few comments about the topic of the conference in the process of doing so.

This country prides itself on having no *national* educational system but rather a state and local one, but there is a pervasive thread that runs throughout our total educational system. We tend to emphasize our differences, but the similarity of the educational system in different parts of the country was brought home to me during this last year when two students—one from Australia and one from Brazil—were commenting on their experiences in the United States. They had both spent a year in the United States approximately ten years earlier in two of our southern states. This time they were completing another year, most of it in California. The main burden of their comments upon questioning was that they did not notice much difference in educational practices in the schools between the time they were first here and their most recent visit. This probably surprises you as it did me, as we would tend to think that there are vast differences between education in the different states and certainly over a period of a decade. I suspect, however, that this common tendency to emphasize our differences has been overdone at times.

Nonetheless, for a variety of imperative reasons, the federal government is entering the educational picture in a major way, and we may expect a larger amount of federal participation in educational matters in the future. This movement is accompanied by much apprehension lest the state and local agencies lose their influence and importance. My judgment is that the opposite is already happening. We need added resources. The only realistic source, in my judgment, lies in the federal taxing power. The important matter will be the way in which we use these resources which we so desperately need. Will we use them wisely? I am cautiously optimistic.

Gradually, but in impressive crescendo, the understanding is drawing upon all of us that schooling and education are only as good as the ed-

ucational personnel in the schools—and especially that it is the teacher in the classroom that matters most. If he is good, little else matters. If he is bad, little else matters. The selection, the training, the retraining, the equipping, and the wise use of educational personnel are at the heart of the matter. Here we are in trouble, and no one knows this better than those of you who occupy the post of Chief State School Officer. First, most of our money goes for educational personnel, particularly teachers. Second, most of our waste and failures occur at this point. And third, educational personnel, especially teachers, are becoming more organized and insistent on having more to say about the conditions under which they will work.

For a variety of reasons, we have begun to turn to technology to solve our educational problems. For a while there were those who thought we might develop teacher-proof curriculums, and the end of our search for an improvement in use of technology is not in sight. There is little question that we need a highly developed educational technology. It is probably as essential for the profession of education as is the pharmaceutical industry for the medical profession. But, as we develop our educational technology, it becomes increasingly clear that we must have ever more highly qualified and diversified personnel, lest the quality of education for children deteriorate. Furthermore, we must use the educational personnel now in service more productively than ever before.

We need an environment that nourishes and promotes the kind of teaching needed for today's and tomorrow's children and youth, but we are not getting this in large enough doses. The current issue of the *Yale Alumni Magazine* contains a poignant tale of a young, bright Ivy-Leaguer who, with pitifully little training but great dedication, went to teach in a ghetto school in Philadelphia. He reports the odds against him and his lack of appropriate training. I wish that I could quote at length from his statement, but hear him as he says, "It hurts to fail to teach these children. School would be one way to escape the harsh conditions of the ghetto. Instead it is one of the conditions of the trap." We can no longer keep school as we once did. We need new patterns of organization, new personnel, new abilities and skills that have been better tested. We are on the road, but only beginning. You will hear reports this next week about some of our new efforts.

While we are still a long way from being out of the woods, we are on the way. As part of a national effort, a network of educational research and development centers and regional educational laboratories has been begun. The Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, one of these centers, is hosting this meeting. Publications describing

it are on the table in the hall. You are free to take them and to order more. We hope that you may visit the Center. Connie and Duane will make arrangements. Many of the staff of the Center will be talking to you of their work, and you will have an opportunity to question them. Those from other Centers and Laboratories will also speak to you.

But one of the most fortunate and long overdue developments in the current educational reform movement was the passage late in 1967 of the Education Professions Development Act and the creation of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development in the U. S. Office of Education. Its first report on *The Education Professions, 1968* has just been published. It is a document of milestone proportions. There will be one such document each year. In each, an attempt will be made to outline a coherent and coordinated national program aimed toward the solution of educational manpower problems in this country. This new agency is one of the healthiest, most vigorous parts of the Washington scene. It is gaining support in the Congress, in the administration, and out in the field. It is soundly conceived and is being well executed. It listens, it responds, and it leads.

One of the chief reasons for its growing success is the man I have the honor now to introduce and the men he's surrounding himself with. The opening keynote speaker of this conference, Don Davies, is a man both you and I know well. Though he is a young man, he is no Johnny-come-lately to education. He is a big, jovial, hard-driving, dedicated, and competent person. He started his career right by beginning in California. He graduated from high school in Beverly Hills. He slipped slightly in beginning college at the University of Southern California, but a short stint in the Navy soon straightened him out, and he came to Stanford, where he received his bachelor's and master's degrees and his initial teaching credential. He returned to teach in the high school from which he graduated. Eventually he received his doctorate at Columbia University's Teachers College in curriculum and teacher education. He has been working in teacher education ever since, in positions of leadership in New York, California, and Minnesota. From his position as director of teacher education at the University of Minnesota, he succeeded Tim Stinnett as Executive Secretary of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, and from there Harold Howe, then Commissioner of Education, selected him to head the new Bureau of Educational Personnel Development. He has won many awards and honors. He serves on many important commissions. It has been my pleasure to work closely with him for many years in our attempts to

improve teacher education in this country. It is a great honor to present him as the opening keynote speaker of this conference. He will speak on the subject, "School Improvement and Staff Development." Dr. Davies.

Conference Résumé

PAUL WOODRING

The conference got off to a good start with a keynote address delivered by Associate Commissioner Don Davies, Director of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development of the U. S. Office of Education. Using visual aids, Davies described the activities of the U. S. Office under the Education Professions Development Act, citing some of the major problems and indicating the directions in which BEPD is moving. He noted that school districts and state departments, as well as colleges and universities, can now get training funds under this act.

Davies stressed the need for prompt action in developing programs in response to drug abuse, problems related to school desegregation, and the need for more effective utilization of school personnel. He said that, although only a little money now is available for assessment and evaluation, it is a good start.

Among the major programs described by Davies were the Teacher Corps Program designed to attract bright young people to education in schools serving low-income students, a TTT (Training Teacher Trainers) program to influence graduate schools to pay more attention to the preparation of future college teachers, including teacher trainers, a new program to replace the old NDEA Summer Institutes, and a Career Opportunities Program which starts in 130 places during the summer and fall of 1970.

Davies also mentioned some important trends in the Bureau's policy which reflect trends in teacher education and personnel development since 1968. These included a trend toward training individuals in ways that will also bring changes in the system, toward training administrators who will affect their entire staff, toward a concentration of resources, away from short, full-time efforts such as summer institutes, and toward long-term but part-time approaches. The summer institutes, he said, were found to be too isolated and to have too little impact on children in the classroom.

Other trends mentioned were those away from university centered programs and toward programs with school-university partnerships, toward on-site training, toward programs involving counselors, administrators, and other school personnel as well as teachers, away from "grantsmanship" competition, away from categorical restrictions and toward flexible programs which can respond rapidly to new needs.

Davies said the Bureau of the Budget and Congress now want an answer to the question, "Do teachers make a difference?" because, if the answer is negative, they will not spend money for teacher training. His own conviction is that, while pupil achievement depends on many factors including individual abilities, family background, and school facilities, the teacher is clearly the most significant factor.

Davies was optimistic about the kind of effective leadership which the states and HEW-Office of Education can exert by acting as partners. He was also optimistic about the future contributions of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development and the Education Professions Development Act. He feels that his Bureau has the support of Congress and the administration as well as the state offices and that it will foster greater recognition of the importance of recruiting and training teachers.

The Administrator's Role in School Improvement

In an address titled, "Establishment Types as Revolutionaries," Luvern Cunningham, Dean of the College of Education at Ohio State University (currently on leave as a Fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences) urged that, instead of waiting for outside critics or disgruntled teachers to do it, school administrators themselves take the lead in offering effective criticism of existing educational institutions, policies, and practices, and in making positive recommendations for improvements. "I believe," he said, "that we need many more reformers and a few more revolutionaries from within our own ranks." He admitted that it was not easy for "dyed-in-the-wool establishment types," who have evolved in traditional ways, to be reformers, both because of other demands on their time and because of the highly bureaucratized environments in which they must work. "We are to a large extent prisoners of our experience," he admitted, and "We lack the insight, the motivation, and the energy to break out of tradition. We are reluctant to adopt nonconventional means in the hope that we can achieve educational purposes more satisfactorily." But, if we do not accept responsibility for reform, he said, others will.

Cunningham commented on a new series of educational reformers who have emerged within the past decade: Paul Goodman, Edgar Friedenberg, George Leonard, Peter Schrag, and Ivan Illich, and said, "Their advocacy includes potential abandonment of the public schools, discontinuance of credentialing and tenure, the discontinuance of compulsory education, incorporation of apprenticeships into the educational experience, as well as substantial community exposure for everyone." He also listed a number of "insiders" who qualify as radicals if not outright revolutionaries: John Holt, Jonathan Kozol, James Herndon, George Dennison, and Herbert Kohl. These men are insiders in the sense that they are, or have been, teachers in public schools. "They are obviously insightful, highly charged observers of American classrooms. They have been there, so to speak. They base commentaries on personal experience, with real, live youngsters. You can hardly fault them for their feelings, even though most of them are negative toward the 'system.' Nor can you question their energetic, sharply toned, critical pens. They write with power and feeling. Their advocacy resembles that of the outsiders with special emphasis on humanizing teaching and institutions. They are persuasive, especially with liberally oriented laymen."

Cunningham then mentioned another class of critic, "less conspicuous and in the long run possibly more important." As historical examples he mentioned John Dewey, Henry Morrison, and William Claude Reavis. (He might well have added the name of Boyd Bode, who was long the most effective gadfly as well as the noted educational philosopher at Dean Cunningham's own university.)

The speaker emphasized the fact that proposals for reform must be evaluated, and some must be discarded. "We are in a period when charlatans are often center stage," he said. "Frequently they are there without challenge. We are also in a period when reinvention of the wheel is a consuming passion with outsiders—and for some insiders as well. We establishment types should be ashamed of our uncritical acceptance of some innovations in education. Some that are advanced with flourish, abandon, and excitement by such persons as John Holt, Peter Schrag, Jonathan Kozol, and George Dennison are typical. We seldom dispute their charges of inadequacies in the public schools. And, at the same time, we seem reluctant to take issue with what they advance as alternative reforms. We are so guilt saturated, because of the frailties of the educational system, that we retreat. We even become masochistic about it."

Cunningham predicted that reform in three unrelated arenas might occur in the '70's. "One of these is the abandoning of compulsory edu-

cation; second is the removal of credentialing and tenure; and the third is the adoption of the voucher system as the principal mechanism for financing education." He added, "If we achieve changes in each of the three our society will have produced an educational revolution." And he urged educators to "speak out, spell out alternatives and move towards the acceptance of those which in our professional judgment are superior. We should not retreat but advance. We should jettison our impulses toward retrogression."

In summarizing his remarks, Cunningham said, "I become uncomfortable when ideas for change are consistently advanced by persons outside of education. . . . We must reverse this trend. We must advance bold new notions. If new alternative patterns of organization are warranted, let's design them. If an extension of citizen responsibility is in order, then let's extend that responsibility to all citizens, not an elitist few. If we need to reconsider certification and tenure, let's call for that examination. If we can achieve educational purposes more effectively through voucher financing, let's work out the details. And in each of these, let's locate ways of joining forces with outsiders with reform impulses similar to ours. We are not going anywhere alone."

Accountability and Performance Contracting

The related topics of evaluation, performance contracting, and accountability provided a major conference theme and aroused a great deal of interest among the participants. Ralph Tyler opened the subject in a speech in which he made key conceptual distinctions between testing of the kind that leads to the training of students in serial order—thus stressing individual differences—and evaluation, which has as its goal the obtaining of empirical evidence about the achievements of a group which can be used to improve procedures. Evaluation is essential to accountability, which means willingness to be judged by results. The schools, he said, need both internal audits and independent outside audits.

A major difficulty in establishing accountability, said Tyler, is that educational goals are often unclear. He urged the Chief State School Officers to accept responsibility for helping educational personnel to clarify their program goals. He also urged the CSSO to aid personnel in defining their individual functions, to give teachers the tools needed to achieve accountability, to provide the necessary organizational structure, and to treat personnel development as seriously as teachers treat pupil development.

Tyler urged that goals be defined in terms of behavior and said that if behavior is defined it can be sampled. He stressed the need for national assessment as a basis for identifying educational problems.

Leon Lessinger, of Georgia State University, delivered an address entitled "An Introduction to Performance Contracting: What Chief State School Officers Should Know," which, despite—or perhaps because of—its controversial nature, many participants considered the highlight of the entire conference. Performance contracting, said Lessinger, can be more than a managerial tool for establishing a rational relationship between costs and benefits—between input and output. It can also be a low-risk instrument for developing new technologies of instruction based on specific learning objectives. The risks are low because the results are contract-guaranteed and the responsibility is shared with the contractor for the success or failure of the program. He said the importance of basing instruction on predetermined objectives—a basic feature of performance contracting—cannot be overrated.

Lessinger described a program based upon a contract between the Schools of Texarkana and Dorsett Educational Systems, Inc., in which Dorsett agreed to advance the reading and mathematical skills of 200 pupils by one grade level in each subject by providing 80 hours of instruction at $80 per student. The pupils were low achievers, mostly from minority groups with family incomes below $2000 a year, who seemed likely to become drop-outs. Preliminary findings show that after 24 hours of instruction all but four of the youngsters in the contracted program had made up deficiencies in one, two, and in some cases as many as four grade levels. Lessinger believes that if these gains are certified by the independent audit, and if they are stable, an important new approach to compensatory education will have been launched. (Lessinger gave only slight attention to the possible dangers in performance contracting, including the possibility that the broader goals of education may be sacrificed to a few specific measurable goals, and conference participants did not offer the criticisms that have been heard from professional organizations.)

Lessinger discussed the kinds of contracting that might be suitable for Title I programs, saying, "all skills—communication, language arts, mathematics as well as vocational achievement—that are measurable in terms of behavioral objectives lend themselves to the concentrated instruction and individualized approach afforded by performance contracts." But a school interested in enlisting the services of contractors cannot just put a notice in the paper saying, "we want performance contracts," lest it become open to all kinds of opportunist organizations, as

well as those qualified to do the job. A judicious preliminary step is to hire technical support people with experience in both program management and contracting. This group, retained as long-term consultants, can then assist local districts or state departments in handling political and economic matters as well as in dealing with educational problems. They can also help develop effective methods for drawing upon community resources of manpower and material.

The educator's role in performance contracting, according to Lessinger, is to determine what the system's shortcomings are, which students have the most pressing deficiencies, and precisely what those students are to gain from a learning experience. In other words, the educator sets both the overall goals and the specific objectives that are to be met through the employment of contracted services. He may call on others for insights, but his voice should be paramount.

Since the validity of the contract will be judged on the basis of what the students actually learn, it is advisable to bring in early an independent auditor who will be making assessments at various points during the program as well as at its completion. The auditor's job is to measure the effectiveness of the program in terms of the student performance that results from the money spent.

Lessinger stressed the importance of clearly stated objectives, agreed upon in advance. As an example, he said that a performance objective for communication skills might be expressed in this way: "After 30 hours of instructional time the student will be able to find out for himself and describe to another student how to get to a remote part of town involving a change of transportation. He will speak for the most part in complete sentences, using a minimal number of pronouns, conjunctions, and reassurance phrases such as 'see? got it? y'know?' The other student will be able to reach the destination by following the directions."

A substantial portion of Lessinger's paper consisted of specific information regarding procedures for making contracts. The entire paper, which is available from the author, will be of interest to any administrator who contemplates entering into performance contracting.

Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged

A major emphasis of the conference was the improvement of education for children who are socially, economically, or emotionally disadvantaged. One of the most effective descriptions of a compensatory program was made by Hugh Scott, Director of the Neighborhood Educational Center in Detroit. Scott opened his remarks by saying, "No school system in America has accomplished more than a minute fraction of what

needs to be done in order to eliminate and to rectify those socioeconomic forces that deny to America's poor and to a vast number of America's blacks any reasonable opportunity for quality education. The flight of both black and white Americans from urban public schools and the increasing gap in achievement between those schools in predominantly black populated areas are demonstrative evidence of the depreciating status and the declining quality of urban public schools. If the public schools of this nation are to be positive agents for actualizing the 'American Dream,' then the factors of race and/or socioeconomic condition cannot be permitted to remain the heaviest determiners of success or lack of success in urban public schools."

The NEC Project, which has been allocated the largest single Title III grant thus far delivered to a school district, involves four schools with 1998 pupils, 140 teachers, and 14 administrators. It is committed to the task of establishing an effective systematic program of individualizing instruction for pupils enrolled in the elementary schools which constitute the project. Individualization of instruction is viewed as the process of identifying needed skills and designing learning activities specifically for these needs. Individualization of instruction is an approach to the teacher-learning process designed to provide more effectively for the range of individual differences to be found among pupils within a classroom. Each pupil is expected to proceed at his own rate in the development of those skills in which he is diagnosed as deficient rather than to progress at a rate established for all pupils. The individualization of instruction does not require that the grouping for instruction be on a one-to-one basis, but a one-to-one relationship at times is necessary.

The placement of teachers in the NEC Project is subject to the approval of the principal of the school, who is obligated to assess teacher performance in terms of compatibility with the essential performance expectations established for teachers.

Dr. Scott is convinced that any program of compensatory education must have goals that are clearly stated, measurable, and achievable. The top-priority goal of his project is "To improve significantly pupil achievement in language and mathematical skills."

Although the original proposal for a Title III grant stated that the Stanford Achievement Test would be the instrument used to assess pupil achievement, it was found that this test is not structured to provide an appropriate assessment of the degree to which the skills advocated in the project's listing of behavioral objectives are being attained by pupils. Consequently, the project administrator contracted with an independent

research organization to develop instruments to identify and assess the critical elements of the project as they contribute or do not contribute to pupil achievement.

This did not solve the problem. In his annual report (distributed to conference participants) Dr. Scott indicated that, during the first year, this organization did not do the job well enough. However, it appears that NEC's relations with this organization have improved in recent months so that it is hoped the project may in time be able to submit clear evidence as to whether it is accomplishing its goal: "To improve significantly pupil achievement in language and mathematical skills."

In sharp contrast to Detroit's NEC Program with its sharply defined goals, the Parkway Project in Philadelphia can almost be said to be a program without goals because its director, John Bremer, doubts that a statement of educational goals has any value. He prefers to place the emphasis on process.

In describing his program for conference participants, Mr. Bremer stressed the fact that it is a school without walls—indeed without a building of any kind. "The spatial boundaries of the educational process in the Parkway Program," he said, "are coterminous with the life space of the student himself," and the program "opens the way for a complete reformulation of what education means for the present day urban student."

Parkway enrolls at present only about 500 students who have been selected by lottery from nearly 10,000 applicants. Any high-school-age boy or girl in Philadelphia may apply, but he must have the consent of a parent. The selection is not random, however, because the usual reason for applying is a profound dissatisfaction with the conventional high school programs. Of the students admitted, 60% are black and 40% white—a ratio similar to that in the total school population of the city.

Each student and faculty member belongs to a tutorial group consisting of about 15 students, a faculty member, and a university intern. This group provides instruction in mathematics and language, evaluates the student's progress, and provides counseling. Each student may also participate in a management group and a town meeting; the latter offers an opportunity for the whole community to discuss common problems.

Though instruction is provided in some of the conventional subjects (on an elective basis), Parkway has no curriculum in the conventional sense. Students move about the city, observing and participating in its varied activities. "The city is our curriculum," said Mr. Bremer, *"because there is nothing to learn about but the city."*

In defending his refusal to establish goals for his students, Bremer said, "Most educational programs treat learning like a journey to some distant destination and students are graded in terms of how far they get along the road. If you go all the way you get an A. The Parkway Program is set up differently. It views the educational problem as being one of finding a starting point for learning. Many students in ordinary schools never get started, but if they ever were to get started their journeys would far exceed the expectations of their teachers. We have great faith in our students, and they do not disappoint us, even though we have a credit or no-credit system. The only grade given is pass."

A third program designed to provide better education for urban children was described by Mrs. Betty Robinson of the Pittsburgh Schools and Mr. John Bolvin of the Learning Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh. Mrs. Robinson gave a lively account of the techniques she uses in raising the level of pupils' aspirations and in changing the attitudes of black parents toward the schools. She cited examples to support her conviction that boys and girls will learn if teachers believe they can learn and expect them to learn. She believes in holding children to the highest standards which each individual can achieve and, though she stressed the fact that a teacher must love the children in her class and be concerned about them as individuals, she adds that love is no substitute for learning. Mrs. Robinson impressed the conference participants with her obvious dedication and enthusiasm, though some of those present were distressed by her obvious lack of admiration for school administrators.

John Bolvin, who works with Mrs. Robinson on the Pittsburgh project, described its "technological aspects," using the phrase to refer to the procedures whereby precise and relevant data concerning each child are reported to teachers as a basis for their planning of the learning experience. Technological equipment does not appear to be used by students in the program, which has been widely described as "Individually Prescribed Instruction"—or IPI; however, it does play an essential role in providing diagnostic and prescriptive information about the student for use by the teacher.

Getting and Holding Better Teachers

The related problems of teacher education, teacher selection and promotion policies, and in-service training, received major attention throughout the conference.

Henry Levin, Associate Professor of Education and Economics at Stanford, focused his attention on the problem of providing better teachers for disadvantaged children in the central cities. In an address titled, "Teachers for Large-City Schools," he also reopened an old issue: merit pay for teachers.

Levin posed three questions: (1) What kinds of teachers are needed for large-city schools? (2) What present policies or conditions prevent school systems from getting and keeping such teachers? And (3) what kinds of changes are necessary for improving the staffing of classrooms in the large cities? He cited recent research that identifies some of the traits important for teaching disadvantaged children. First, a teacher should possess a high level of verbal facility, and this is especially important for teachers of disadvantaged children because it enables them to bridge the gap between their own middle-class language patterns and the various dialects spoken by children coming from other kinds of homes.

The second teacher characteristic stressed by Levin was the teacher's attitude toward disadvantaged children. The attitude of the teacher toward the educability of his pupils tends to become a self-fulfilling prophecy, "yet surveys have shown that many city teachers believe that disadvantaged children have low educational potential, and it appears that the teacher's low expectations for these children occupy a crucial role in hindering student achievement. Accordingly, we need teachers who welcome the challenge of teaching disadvantaged children and who see great educational potentialities for these students."

A third trait stressed by Levin is adequate educational background in the subject the teacher is teaching. Yet, he said, "the attitudes of teachers are not even considered in recruitment, teachers show relatively low abilities in all academic areas, and teachers are systematically assigned to teach courses for which they lack background." And he added that disadvantaged students are taught by the teachers with the lowest levels of verbal ability. He urged that these policies and practices be reversed—that the best teachers, particularly those with the highest degree of verbal facility, be assigned to classes of disadvantaged children.

Levin said that the barriers to solving this problem are to be found in existing salary and assignment practices and in present licensing requirements, and he added, "perhaps the most disabling of these policies is the single salary schedule." He made a vigorous plea for a new salary schedule which, instead of basing salaries on degree levels and teaching experience, would reward excellence in teaching and penalize ineffective

teaching. He said that in other organizations demonstrated proficiencies lead to promotion and higher pay, and contended that proficiency should also be the criterion for teacher pay. He added, "special salary increments should be offered to teachers who accept assignments in the schools with the gravest shortages of qualified teachers. In general, the schools of the inner city face the severest recruitment problems. Teachers tend to shun those schools because of their slum surroundings, the special effort required for working with children of a different culture, and the highly publicized discipline problems and attendant personal risks which teachers envision in those schools."

Robert Koff, Assistant Professor and Director of Teacher Education at Stanford, spoke on the topic, "Crisis in Content in Teacher Education." Koff opened his remarks by admitting that he has been actively engaged in the education of teachers for only a little over two years. He then cited evidence that a considerable number of scholars, teachers, and laymen are highly critical of traditional practices in teacher education.

"It is our belief," said Koff, "that a teacher must be trained to know intuitively what the learner's next need is and what act is most appropriate for fulfilling that need. It might even be argued that the whole institution of teaching is simply the evolutionary result of externalizing learner needs while in the process of learning—the primary, if not the ultimate, goal of teaching is to internalize in the learner the devices he needs to learn so that he progressively becomes independent of external control; that is, he learns how to learn." He admitted, however, that "At the present time we do not know how to train teachers to be more effective in such behavior."

Koff noted that, although certification requirements are being loosened in several states, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education has just published a series of standards for evaluating teacher preparation programs which would seem to be a step toward the tightening of standards. He commented that the recommendations of the AACTE have been approved despite the fact that no definite studies have been conducted to support the application of these standards.

Koff called attention to the fact that many fifth-year programs in teacher education are in economic difficulty, that the MAT programs at Yale and Johns Hopkins have been discontinued, and that Harvard is discontinuing its year-long internships. He noted that changes in supply and demand are having an impact on recruitment, training, and placement policies. He recommended selection procedures which identify those teachers who are not only highly qualified academically, but also have a high probability of remaining in the profession as teachers, noting

that only about 60% of those completing training programs actually go into teaching and that of this group only about 25% remain in the profession for more that three years. He stressed the importance of in-service training and urged teacher training institutions to be more actively involved in it. He observed, too, that teacher education suffers from a status problem—that the training of teachers is given low academic priority within institutions of higher education and in most state and federal categorical aid programs. He saw a need for the development of teacher training materials that link theory with practice.

A paper prepared by Robert Hess and Michael Kirst of the Stanford faculty, and titled, "Political Orientation and Behavior Patterns: Linkages between Teachers and Children" was read by Dr. Kirst. Since this is heavily documented with a great many footnotes, and contains a number of charts, graphs, and tables, it obviously was intended for publication rather than for oral presentation.

In introducing his subject Dr. Kirst said, "It is the purpose of this paper to explore the extent and implications of the congruence between political orientations of children and school professionals." Kirst said his analysis would focus on the era of the late 1950's and early 1960's and would draw particularly on a Chicago study conducted by Easton and Hess, with Dennis and Torney. He added, "This and other studies of socialization show several general features. One of these is that socialization of children into the political system begins early, long before they reach legal voting age, and probably has its greatest period of growth during the elementary school years. This growth appears to be related to the development of cognitive and affective capabilities and is acquired by several different processes. These studies, however, have focused on measuring children's attitudes with only minor attention to possible causes and linkages."

After reviewing the evidence from a number of research studies, Kirst concluded: "A summary picture of the aspects of the political life of the school of particular relevance to this paper is that many students have a great deal of confidence in the trustworthiness, responsiveness, and competence of our political system; they prefer to believe that the opinion or will of the people as expressed through the election processes constitutes the effective and preferred routes through which the citizen may influence the political process. The notions that there are strong competing forces within the society exerting less obvious pressures in behalf of their own interests or that there are unresolved conflicts within the system are unwelcome thoughts."

Professor Kirst then commented on "the growing militancy of school

professionals," by which phrase he apparently meant teachers rather than supervisors and administrators. He said, "The focus of our analysis is upon the congruence between political orientations and behavior of school officials and those of children in the early 1960's. Whether or not these phenomena are linked in any causal way, it is useful to examine changes in the political attitudes and behavior of school professionals since that time. Whether changes have occurred presumably has important implications for the study of political attitudes of children. It may both provide a basis for the beginning of a predictable theory of political orientations and indicate some revision of traditional concepts about socializing processes."

The most significant of these changes, according to Kirst, is the growing militancy and activism of teachers. "Teacher organizations are now competing through use of collective and militant tactics for increased politial power and benefits for their members. A national poll indicated that teachers' support of the use of strikes rose from 53% in 1965 to 70% in 1968. The traditional professional harmony and avoidance of conflict has been shattered in the cities where AFT literature features the theme of brave and dedicated teacher unionists being exploited by reactionary employers. The NEA affiliates have increased their use of professional sanctions and their tactics are often indistinguishable from the unionists. The use of organized collective pressures is beginning to extend to curriculum concerns as well as salaries and working conditions." And he added, "In 1956, only 23% of the nation's teachers thought they should work actively as members of political parties in elections. . . . By 1968, 81% of the men and 71% of the women favored campaign work."

Kirst then offered a word of warning, "If teachers use their collective strength to influence political conflicts, they will also have to face retribution from the politicians they oppose or offend. By entering the arena of political action, they lose the protection of neutrality and become even more vulnerable to political pressure. This will be especially true if their activities appear to be in pursuit of their own interests as teachers rather than in the interests of the school children they teach."

In concluding his remarks, Professor Kirst said, "The similarity between the behavior of teachers and attitudes of elementary school children in the early '60's together with the dramatic change in the level of teachers' political activism have a number of implications for the study of political learning in children. It seems probable, although not demonstrated by these data, that the attitudes of children were molded by the direct teaching and modeling influences of the teachers. However, it is also possible that the attitudes of both teachers and children were

affected by other more general societal influences. Thus the *direction* of socialization is by no means established by the congruence of the trends we have presented in this paper. . . .

"Another implication of these data and the trends they may represent is that political action and activism on the part of both youth and teachers result in a change in alignment in the interface between student populations and the faculty of the school. The traditional generational hierarchy of faculty vs. student within an institution will probably be altered by cooperation between students and individual faculty members around political issues.

"As teachers become more politically active it seems likely that within the ranks of teachers there will be differences in opinion and discussion over specific political issues. This increases the possibility of cooperative arrangements which will bring groups of students and faculty into confrontation with other groups of students and faculty. Such a development will obviously alter the traditional balance of authority within the institutions and has implications for institutional change and stability as well as the opportunities it offers students to acquire political sophistication and skills."

Two of the conference sessions were activity programs designed, apparently, to familiarize the Chief State School Officers with current popular approaches to the improvement of interpersonal relations among pupils, teachers, and administrators. The first of these, led by Carl Thoresen, Associate Professor of Education and Research and Development Associate, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, and Ted Alper, a post-doctoral Fellow of the Stanford Institute for Behavioral Counseling, was titled, "Developing Personally Competent Teachers: A Behavioral View." Thoresen and Alper were assisted by three graduate students: Virginia DuPraw, Gary Kirkorian, and David Stuhr.

Conference members were presented with ten sheets of paper of variegated colors—orange, blue, green, yellow, buff, and pink—stapled. The medium apparently was the message because each sheet contained only a few sentences, typed at various angles across the page. The first said only ,"Good morning." The second, on a page of a different color, said, "Please sit down, relax and read this for the next 3 minutes or so." At the top of the next page was the question: "Who is personally competent?" and this was followed by a number of possible answers, each written at a different angle: "Someone who can make things happen." "He's kind of a great manager of his own life." "Got a lot of self-esteem,

you know." "She can really relate in different ways to all kinds of people."

The other sheets contained a variety of messages. Examples: "There are many, many reasons why children and youth are turned off today—Right—." "But the teacher can make a difference—."

The final sheet said, "Since we're concerned with 'accountability' (you've heard of course) we have some performance criteria planned for you. Let's start with using behavioral objectives. After that we'll do something in 'desensitization' (we'll explain) as an internal self-control technique. Later, we'll sample some work in using positive consequences in contingent ways. As we go along, we'll show you some data from our work. Again—GOOD MORNING."

After they had been given a few minutes to ponder these statements, conference members were asked to participate in making a list of behavioral objectives and in finding techniques for "the systematic desensitization" of teachers who are exposed to anxiety-producing situations. The session was concluded with an exercise in the progressive relaxation of muscles, led by Miss DuPraw, who followed procedures outlined in E. Jacobson's book, *Progressive Relaxation,* of some 35 years ago.

Another activity session which reflected current approaches to the improvement of interpersonal relations, "Social Interactions in the Supervision Process," was led by Frank B. W. Hawkinshire, Assistant Professor of Education at Stanford. This session employed an adaptation of role-playing techniques. Hawkinshire began his presentation by dividing the conference participants into two teams, one member of which was instructed to play the role of administrator or "superior" while the other played the role of teacher or "inferior." Each member was then instructed to tell his teammate exactly what he thought of him and then report to the total group what his feelings had been. Hawkinshire then discussed and interpreted the responses and offered his own comments on the nature of administrative and supervisory roles.

The reaction of conference participants to these presentations will be discussed in the section on evaluation at the conclusion of this report.

Curricular Reform and Improved Instructional Techniques

One of the most effectively delivered speeches of the conference was that of J. H. Werntz, Director of the Center for Curriculum Studies of the University of Minnesota. "Of all the responsibilities of the educational system," said Dr. Werntz, "none is more important than the systematic and regular development of curricula and curricular materials as well as

methods of instruction. And of all the current needs of the educational system, none is more important than at once reinforcing old and inventing new means for the systematic development of curricular materials and for their assimilation into the schools.

"There is abundant evidence that the many major curriculum development projects of the past 10 to 15 years have provided sharp improvements in the quality of school materials. Under the support of the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and consortia of schools and private agencies, major effort has been directed at specific school curriculum problems.

"The general basis for operation of the projects has been fairly uniform: teams of subject matter specialists and education specialists, together with professionals in evaluation, and sometimes, school personnel, construct materials, printed and otherwise, and weave them into the fabric of the curriculum. The materials are evaluated in cooperating schools under controlled conditions, and the results form the school guide revision. Following the necessary cycles of revision, the materials are made available for general use through release into the public domain or through commercial channels.

"The curriculum development projects have, in the main, succeeded in their primary objective: they *have* produced materials notably more authoritative and demonstrably more effective with children when used by properly prepared school personnel. But it is also true that the effect on American education, both in the schools and in higher education, has been minor. It is important to understand the reasons for this lack of general success and, thereby, to discover the means by which to build on the partial success of the curriculum development movement."

In commenting on the failures of the movement, Dr. Werntz made three observations:

"1. The effect of the curriculum development movement on school practice has been at best barely discernible.

"2. The effect of the curriculum development movement on undergraduate programs for prospective elementary and secondary school personnel has been negligible.

"3. The effect of the curriculum development movement on graduate programs for elementary and secondary school personnel has been negligible." (Some of the conference members thought that Werntz was being unjustifiably gloomy in making these observations—they were of the opinion that the effect of the movement on both classroom practice and teacher education was somewhat greater than he seemed to be aware.)

In another respect, however, Werntz concluded that the movement has been at least a partial success. "The partial success of the curriculum development movement rests with the simple fact that men of imagination, representing a wide range of individual views of the educational process, were provided with resources to work together on a common educational task. The perspective of the scholar, the knowledge of the educator, the practical experience of school personnel, and the analytic judgment of the evaluator combine to a total greater than the simple sum of the parts. The resulting materials and curricula have been less than excellent in those efforts dominated by or devoid of contributions from any one of these groups, be it scholars, educators, school personnel, or evaluators.

"While the resulting materials are the visible result of this collaboration, the most profound effect of the curriculum development movement has been the remarkable broadening of educational horizons of the several specialized groups working together, as colleagues, on the common task. For it is a demonstrated fact that the process of curriculum development contains the ingredients of intellectual stimulation and practical need sufficient to attract a wide spectrum of individuals whose contribution is essential to the improvement of the educational process."

Werntz concluded his remarks with a proposal for "a long-term national effort to develop vigorous programs in school curriculum development in universities with a major responsibility for developing school personnel." He said that each curriculum development center should consist of a "comfortable alliance" between a college or university and not less than two school systems, and that priority should be given to proposals from centers including school systems with educational problems resulting from the presence of minority groups and pupils from families of low social and economic status. He proposed that the staff of the center include university faculty members, graduate students, teachers, supervisors, specialists, and administrators. He suggested that the staff of the center should accept two responsibilities: (1) To develop and evaluate curriculum materials and (2) to counter the general failure of the curriculum development movement by offering regular preservice and in-service instruction for school personnel. In conclusion he said, "The particular strength of the curriculum development movement has been the process by which the materials are systematically developed. The curriculum development movement must now seek to exploit its fundamental strength."

Professor Patrick Suppes of the Stanford faculty offered an excellent description of computer-assisted instruction. A new development such

as this, according to Suppes, goes through three distinct stages. The first stage consists of experimentation in large and sophisticated centers, such as the one at Stanford, which develops the necessary procedures. The second stage consists of demonstration projects and the third of operating programs in the schools. The third stage has not yet been reached in computerized instruction—the present stage of development is somewhere between stages one and two. Introduction into the schools will take time and money, but Suppes predicts that 15% of all students will be using some form of computer-assisted instruction by 1980. Such instruction is appropriate in the teaching of many subjects, notably reading, language skills including those necessary for a second language, and mathematics. Special education and tutorial work also lend themselves to the use of computers.

N. L. Gage of the Stanford faculty, who is also Acting Director of the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, spoke on the distinction between research and development. The goals of research, he said, are well understood. They include knowledge, understanding, prediction, and control. The nature of development—the D in R&D—is less widely understood. Its goal is to design and produce procedures or practices which are widely applicable in the classroom. Examples of such development include microteaching packets of instruction, and videotapes of classroom activities.

Some other examples of development at the Stanford Center are materials for training teachers to perceive whether or not their students are paying attention, to improve the effectiveness of their explanations, to predict how well future teachers will get along with their students, and to develop what is called warranted uncertainty on the part of their students—uncertainty of the kind that students ought to feel when they really don't know the answer.

Gage went on to give examples of the "obviousness" of what has been found in one of the Center's programs: "The teaching of tenured teachers proceeds in an environment of excessive evaluation." "Teaching is overburdened with rewards and punishments." "Teachers are overinvolved in interaction with their fellow teachers." All of these findings seem altogether obvious—except that *the actual findings of the Center's sociologists are exactly the opposite of those stated.*

In short, "In the long run, and in the short run as well, it seems to me the solutions to our enormous problems must come from R&D programs like these. Without them, we are doomed to repeat past errors, or to proceed on the basis of power and political clout, or to hope that we shall stumble somehow on to the right paths. But if the R&D efforts

are given the money and the men to do their job, our history, in all parts of our society, gives us every right to expect that within our time the nation's schools will come much closer to serving well all the children of all the people."

Evaluation of the Conference

Conferences, conference planners, and conference speakers rarely are subjected to anything that can properly be called evaluation. When the last speech is made, and the good-byes are said, everyone goes home without being asked whether or not the conference was worth the time and trouble. Except for an occasional complimentary remark from an old friend, or a young admirer, speakers are not told whether or not their speeches contributed anything that the audience wanted to hear. The planners have no way of knowing whether their plans achieved the desired purpose. As a result the same mistakes are repeated when the time for another conference rolls around.

Responses of Conference Participants

The conference described in this publication was a happy exception to all these generalizations. Evaluation was a built-in part of the planning. On the last day, all participants were asked to complete an evaluation form, a copy of which appears in Appendix C.

On the first page of the form, participants were instructed: "Please rate the presentations listed below in terms of their contribution to your thinking in the areas of personnel development. This presentation contributed: Very Much, Much, Little, None (check one)." All participants turned in their forms though a few did not complete all items.

In response to this question, the presentations of Suppes on computer-assisted instruction, Lessinger on performance contracting, Werntz on school curriculum development, and Tyler on evaluation and accountability, received the highest ratings. No more than three of the participants rated the contribution of any of these presentations as "little" or "none." Scott's presentation of the NEC Project, Bolvin and Robinson on the Pittsburgh Program, and Davies' keynote address also received high ratings ("much" or "very much") from at least two-thirds of the

conference members. The reaction to the eight other presentations was mixed, but only one presentation received more poor ratings ("little" or "none") than favorable ones. For any conference this is a high batting average—one in which the planners may take pride.

In response to the question, "Which of the themes dealt with in this conference would you like to have explored more fully in future conferences?" the participants said they would like to hear more about evaluation, accountability, teacher education including in-service training, curriculum development, educational technology, performance contracting, accreditation, social interaction, ETV, the voucher plan, leadership techniques, working with legislatures, political realities facing educators, computerized instruction, and merit pay.

The second part of the same question, which asked which topics *not included* in this year's conference should be put on the agenda of future meetings, elicited suggestions of attention to problems of organizing state departments of education, teacher negotiations, ways of dealing with militancy, new curriculum proposals including a study of population problems, pollution, public aid for non-public schools, differentiated staffing, ETV, student involvement in decision making, more concentration on "how children learn," teacher tenure, performance certification, R&D Centers, and "the anatomy of confrontation."

In response to the question, "What high priority items (discussed in this conference) would you like to introduce in your state?" one answer stood out clearly above all the others: "Accountability." Performance contracting and improving teacher education were mentioned by several individuals.

The daily format of the conference included three speeches or "presentations," each followed by reactions from a pre-selected panel, after which some time was permitted for discussion from the floor. When asked, "Do you think these arrangements were effective?" 25 of the 30 voted *yes,* but about half qualified their vote by suggesting that there be fewer speakers or other presentations and more time for discussion. Three or four said they would eliminate the panels. One proposed that each day's program be summarized at the end of the day by a "wrap-up" man who would place things in perspective.

About two-thirds of the group liked the informal evening sessions (a larger number than attended them regularly) but some thought they were a bit *too* informal—that they ought to be at least partially structured.

The conference ran from Thursday, July 30 to Friday, August 7, with free time on Saturday and Sunday for recreation. The majority liked this arrangement but exactly one-third said they would prefer to start

on a Monday and end on Friday or Saturday. Three members of the group would have preferred a longer period of eight or ten working days.

The request for comments and suggestions for improvement on the manner in which the conference was planned and arrangements for transportation and housing were handled, brought enthusiastic approval from almost everyone. Typical comments: "The availability of staff members to accommodate participants was most noteworthy," "All aides performed with distinction," "All details handled very well," "All more than satisfactory," and "Connie did a *great* job." Reimbursement procedures were given a high rating by all, except for one cautious individual who said, "Remains to be seen."

The eighth question, "Since education is a two-way process, what do you suggest, from your unique vantage points as Chief State School Officers, which would help these individuals (the conference speakers and session leaders) in correcting shortcomings in their views in order that they might contribute more effectively to the educational scene?" brought forth more critical comment than any other question. Typical comments: "Many of the speakers had very little conception of the role of State Departments of Education," "Too many lacked hard-nosed experience of establishing educational policies and having to defend these in the arena of public opinion," "A better blending of theory with real life practices. There's a lot of research but it is not effectively communicated," "Several speakers need longer experience in teaching in public school classrooms, several speakers seemed to deliver talks from classroom lecture notes, speakers tended to try to 'sell' their programs rather than to 'explore' them with conference participants," "They should be held accountable for their theories," "Some just presented a college lecture," "Most speakers were too anxious to change the system rather than improve it," "Some speakers never got to the assigned subject," "The role-players ought to try playing the role of a State Chief School Officer," "Less 'talking to' and more interaction and debate," "Involvement of students in some of the presentations might have been helpful," and "Have some selected Chiefs on the program."

The final question, "What did you like best about the conference?" brought forth the positive and approving comments, of which there were many. One of the things liked best was the opportunity to meet the Chiefs of other states, to compare views and problems, and to interact with them. It seems clear that some of the conference participants thought they learned more from other Chiefs than from the speakers. There was general approval of the broad scope of the conference and the range of backgrounds of speakers selected. Most liked the informal atmosphere.

And several commented that Duane Mattheis was an excellent choice to organize the conference because, having himself been a Chief State School Officer, he understood how to deal with the group.

Editorial Comments

The responses of participants, summarized in the preceding section, indicate clearly that it was a good conference. It was good because it was intelligently planned and effectively conducted and because the conference members took a vigorous part in it. Its weaknesses were, for the most part, weaknesses that are characteristic of conferences. A few of the speakers read formal papers which, though they contained valuable information, seemed to have been intended for publication rather than for oral delivery, with the result that listeners found them difficult to follow. Some of the discussions never quite got off the ground. Some of the participants, who might have offered perceptively critical comments that would have added significantly to the discussions, saved their comments for private conservations afterward.

Some of these comments which were made after the formal presentation are worthy of mention here. In reacting to Professor Levin's proposal of merit pay for teachers, most of the Chief State School Officers were willing to agree that teacher pay ought to be based on quality of teaching. They contended, however, that it is not the administrators who have blocked all efforts to establish pay systems based on merit. The opposition, they said, comes largely from teachers' organizations including both the AFT and the NEA. They saw little possibility that the policies of these organizations will change.

Conference participants also agreed with Levin that the best teachers ought to be assigned to classrooms in the inner cities where the problems are greatest, but they saw no way of overcoming the opposition of teachers' organizations to such assignment. One superintendent observed ironically that if Professor Levin were to act consistently with his own thesis he would leave Stanford University, which accepts only academically talented students, and seek a job in a college that enrolls disadvantaged students and slow learners. He commented that Levin probably prefers to teach at Stanford for exactly the same reason that good public school teachers prefer to teach in the upper-middle-class suburbs—it is both easier and more prestigious.

Although the description of the Parkway Program in Philadelphia also aroused interest as a possible way of providing for pupils who find the conventional high schools unbearable, some of the Chief State School

Officers felt that Mr. Bremer weakened his case, and made his program unneccessarily difficult to defend, by refusing to state the goals of his project and by making such extreme statements as, "Chronological age has absolutely nothing to do with education," "Educational improvement is impossible without a total rearrangement of the administrative structure," and "I don't care whether my students learn to read." Most of the conference participants felt that, while the importance of chronological age may have been exaggerated by educators, age must have a little something to do with education, that some improvement might well be possible with only a *partial* rearrangement of the administrative structure—or even without regard to the administrative structure—and that an educator ought to care about whether his students learn to read, because an individual who reaches adulthood without learning to read is very severely handicapped.

Questions also were raised about Bremer's statement, "The city is also our curriculum because there is nothing to learn about but the city." It was pointed out that there are many other things to learn about, and that a city child who learns about nothing but the city will have woefully limited horizons. The point was well taken because the current population trend is away from the large cities and toward the suburbs. In our highly mobile society it seems a safe guess that many of the boys and girls now living in Philadelphia will spend their adult lives elsewhere and ought to become aware that the city is not the sum total of human existence. To say that city children should learn about nothing but the city makes no more sense than to say that suburban children should learn about nothing but the suburbs or that farm children should learn about nothing but the farm.

In defense of Mr. Bremer it may be said that he probably was making these statements to get attention and did not intend them to be taken literally. But it must be admitted that opponents of the program, by quoting such remarks, can do great harm to the project—and probably will.

Conference participants found little to disagree with in the paper titled "Crisis in Content in Teacher Education," but they also found little that was new to them. The fact that teacher education suffers from a status problem and is given low priority in prestigious private universities such as Stanford was too well known to this audience to need repetition. The fact that many scholars and laymen are highly critical of teacher education was hardly news to administrators of long experience. One participant commented that teacher education has been said to be in a state of crisis for at least 25 years, and yet there seems to be general

agreement that there has been some gradual improvement in the quality of teachers produced during this same period.

The two sessions designed to make administrators more sensitive to the complexities of interpersonal relations stimulated a considerable amount of subsequent discussion, but the reaction was mixed. While a few were enthusiastic, others felt that they had been treated in a patronizing fashion and that the leaders had unintentionally demonstrated a strange lack of sensitivity to the nature of this particular audience. One commented that the jazzy technique of using varicolored sheets of paper with dramatic statements in bad English—obviously an attention-getting device—would have been more appropriate for third-grade children than for Chief State School Officers. Another observed that the technique of progressive relaxation presented as a new technique was one that he had learned more than 30 years ago when he first read Jacobson's *Progressive Relaxation*. The generation gap was clearly apparent.

Several participants felt that the role-playing technique presented was artificial, that the leaders were preoccupied with the "boss syndrome" which is outdated in education, and that asking an individual to tell "exactly what he thought" of an individual whom he scarcely knew could only bring forth prejudiced statements which would make it more difficult for the two individuals to establish a harmonious working relationship later. Some expressed doubts that the technique of deliberately causing embarrassment through an invasion of privacy is a sound approach to the improvement of interpersonal relations.

Questions were raised as to whether techniques originally developed for therapeutic purposes were really appropriate for groups whose goal is education rather than therapy, and questions were raised about the soundness of the psychological principles underlying sensitivity training, group process, and role-playing. No consensus was reached.

The scope of the conference, and its focus of interest, clearly reflected the national concerns of the day. The emphasis was upon the problems of large urban centers and the problems of providing compensatory education for disadvantaged groups. Though such a focus seems appropriate enough in 1970, those who plan future conferences of Chief State School Officers might well bear in mind the fact that the majority of these officers represent states in which there are no large cities and that children living in smaller cities, in the suburbs, in small towns, and on the farm, have a right to a good education, too.

The statement that we live in an urbanized nation has become one of the favorite clichés of our day but, like all clichés, it is at best a half truth. Those who speak of urban problems frequently confine their re-

marks to the problems of cities with more than one million population. But only 10% of all Americans live in cities of this size. By comparison, even today, nearly 30% live in areas classed by the U.S. census bureau as "rural" (farms plus villages with fewer than 2500 inhabitants). Yet the 10% get far more attention than the 30%. And, though the trend away from the farm and small towns is continuing, it is not true that people are rushing toward the cities; indeed, since 1950 many of the largest cities have *lost* population. The trend has been away from the cities and toward the suburbs. The problems of the schools of the suburbs are real enough, but they are very different from those of the inner cities. And suburban schools were scarcely mentioned in this conference.

Several of the Chiefs attending this conference represented states (Wyoming, Alaska, Vermont, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana) in which the largest city has not more than 65,000 inhabitants. As I listened to the speeches I wondered what these Superintendents thought of the speaker who said, "Now our lives are urban lives—not rural lives, nor suburban lives, but urban lives." Obviously he was not in touch with *this* part of his audience. I thought about the 15 million American children who still attend rural schools and wondered why no one at the conference ever mentioned them. Are we prepared to write off this entire segment of our population? Does anyone really believe that the problems of rural schools have all been solved by consolidation?

Some of the presentations, to be sure, dealt with problems that are common to all schools, large or small, rural, suburban or urban. Tyler's comments on evaluation, Werntz's on school curriculum, and perhaps Lessinger's on performance contracting, and Suppes's on computer-assisted instruction, are examples. But when another conference is planned it might be a good idea to have at least one or two presentations that focus specifically on the problems of rural schools, including those too far from any center of population to make consolidation feasible. What could be done in a school with only two or four teachers if really good equipment were made available and the best possible teachers were recruited—if the amount of money spent per child were as great as that spent on each child in the suburbs or in the inner cities? The question opens up some exciting possibilities—one that would surely arouse the interests of the Chief School Officers of many states. Other sessions might well give attention to the special problems of suburban schools—not just the Scarsdales, Beverly Hills, and Grosse Pointes, but also the many new suburbs in which children come from a wide variety of social classes and ethnic backgrounds. None of this would need to detract appropriate attention from the schools of the inner cities.

All educational conferences give attention to the question: What could be done to improve education if we had more money? Without ignoring this question, it would be appropriate also to ask a second one: What can be done to improve education that does *not* require more money? An imaginative educator could offer a number of possible answers to this question and these possibilities should be explored. Finding the right speaker or leader for such a session would, of course, be of utmost importance.

One of the goals of conferences such as this is to give Chief State School Officers time to think more deeply about education itself—its nature, its processes, and its proper goals. While they are at home and on the job, it is inevitable that top administrators must devote much of their time and energies to problems that are essentially financial, political, and administrative rather than educational. But if this is all they do, they fail to carry out their most vital responsibility—that of intellectual leadership. A conference makes it possible for them to enjoy a few days away from administrative problems and offers them an opportunity to think more deeply about the things that matter most.

Appendix A

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

Don M. Dafoe, Executive Secretary
*Al Lilywhite, Assistant to Executive Secretary
1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
July 1970

ALABAMA
Ernest Stone
Superintendent of Education
State Department of Education
Montgomery 36104

*ALASKA
Cliff R. Hartman
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Alaska Office Building
Juneau 99801

AMERICAN SAMOA
Robert F. Williams
Director of Education
Department of Education
Pago Pago, Tutuila 96920

*ARIZONA
Weldon P. Shofstall
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Phoenix 85007

ARKANSAS
A. W. Ford
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Little Rock 72201

CALIFORNIA
Max Rafferty
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Sacramento 95814

*CANAL ZONE
Francis A. Castles
Superintendent of Schools
Division of Schools
Balboa Heights

*COLORADO
Byron W. Hansford
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Denver 80203

CONNECTICUT
William J. Sanders
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Hartford 06115

*DELAWARE
Kenneth C. Madden
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Dover 19901

FLORIDA
Floyd T. Christian
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Tallahassee 32304

*Chief State School Officers in attendance at 1970 Stanford conference

GEORGIA
Jack P. Nix
Superintendent of Schools
State Department of Education
Atlanta 30334

*GUAM
Franklin Quitugua
Director of Education
Department of Education
Agana 96910

HAWAII
Ralph H. Kiyosaki
Superintendent of Education
State Department of Education
P. O. Box 2360
Honolulu 96804

IDAHO
D. F. Engelking
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Boise 83702

ILLINOIS
Ray Page
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Springfield 62706

*INDIANA
Richard D. Wells
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Indianapolis 46206

*IOWA
Paul F. Johnston
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Des Moines 50319

*KANSAS
C. Taylor Whittier
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Topeka 66612

*KENTUCKY
Wendell P. Butler
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Frankfort 40601

LOUISIANA
William J. Dodd
Superintendent of Education
State Department of Education
Baton Rouge 70804

MAINE
William T. Logan, Jr.
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Augusta 04330

*MARYLAND
James A. Sensenbaugh
State Superintendent of Schools
State Department of Education
Baltimore 21201

MASSACHUSETTS
Neil V. Sullivan
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
182 Tremont Street
Boston 02111

*MICHIGAN
John W. Porter
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Lansing 48902

*MINNESOTA
Howard B. Casmey
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
St. Paul 55101

*MISSISSIPPI
Garvin Johnston
Superintendent of Education
State Department of Education
Jackson 39205

MISSOURI
Hubert Wheeler
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Jefferson City 65101

*MONTANA
Dolores Colburg (Mrs.)
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Helena 59601

NEBRASKA
Cecil E. Stanley
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Lincoln 68509

*NEVADA
Burnell Larson
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Carson City 89701

*NEW HAMPSHIRE
Newell J. Paire
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Concord 03301

NEW JERSEY
Carl L. Marburger
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Trenton 08625

*NEW MEXICO
Leonard J. DeLayo
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Santa Fe 87501

NEW YORK
Ewald B. Nyquist
Commissioner of Education
State Education Department
Albany 12204

*NORTH CAROLINA
A. Craig Phillips
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Raleigh 27602

*NORTH DAKOTA
M. F. Peterson
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Bismarck 58501

*OHIO
Martin W. Essex
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Columbus 43215

OKLAHOMA
Scott Tuxhorn
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Oklahoma City 73105

*OREGON
Dale Parnell
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Board of Education
Salem 97310

*PENNSYLVANIA
David H. Kurtzman
Secretary of Education
State Department of Education
Harrisburg 17126

PUERTO RICO
Ramon Mellado
Secretary of Education
Department of Education
Vela Street, Stop 34
Hato Rey 00919

*RHODE ISLAND
William P. Robinson, Jr.
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Providence 02908

SOUTH CAROLINA
Cyril B. Busbee
Superintendent of Education
State Department of Education
Columbia 29201

*SOUTH DAKOTA
Gordon A. Diedtrich
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Pierre 57501

TENNESSEE
J. Howard Warf
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Nashville 37219

TEXAS
J. W. Edgar
Commissioner of Education
Texas Education Agency
Austin 78711

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS
R. Burl Yarberry
Commissioner for Education
Office of the High Commissioner
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands
Saipan, Mariana Islands 96950

UTAH
Walter Talbot
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Board of Education
Salt Lake City 84111

VERMONT
Harvey Scribner
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Montpelier 05602

VIRGINIA
Woodrow W. Wilkerson
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Board of Education
Richmond 23216

VIRGIN ISLANDS
Phillip A. Gerard
Commissioner of Education
Department of Education
P. O. Box 630
Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas
00801

*WASHINGTON
Louis Bruno
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Olympia 98501

WEST VIRGINIA
Rex M. Smith
Superintendent of Free Schools
State Department of Education
Charleston 25305

*WISCONSIN
William C. Kahl
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Wisconsin Hall - 126 Langdon St.
Madison 53703

WYOMING
Harry Roberts
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Cheyenne 82001

Appendix B

PROGRAM OF THE CONFERENCE

Educational Personnel Development Conference
for
Chief State School Officers

"Educational Personnel Development:
Challenge of the Seventies"

Sponsored by

Stanford Teacher Leadership Development Institute
an affiliated project of the
Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching
School of Education
Stanford University

Robert N. Bush, Director, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching (on leave)
N. L. Gage, Acting Director, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching
H. Thomas James, Dean, School of Education, Stanford University
Duane J. Mattheis, Associate Director, Educational Personnel Conference
Paul Woodring, Editor-at-Large, *Saturday Review,* Writer of Conference Report
Constance Kirby, Program Assistant, Educational Personnel Conference
Peter Burchyns, Research Assistant
Guilbert C. Hentschke, Research Assistant

Robert House, Research Assistant
Robert Williams, Research Assistant
Diane Ware, Conference Assistant
Rex Fortune, Research Assistant

and

Teacher Leadership Development Branch
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
United States Office of Education

Don Davies, Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
Dustin Wilson, Chief, Teacher Leadership Development Branch (acting)

Thursday, July 30

Registration Upon Arrival

8:30 p.m. Opening Session
Master of Ceremonies: *Arthur P. Coladarci,* Acting Dean, School of Education, Stanford University
Welcome to Stanford, *E. Howard Brooks,* Vice-Provost, Stanford University
Comments from CCSSO, *Byron Hansford,* Past President, CCSSO
Introductory Remarks, *Robert N. Bush,* Director, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching (on leave)
Keynote Speaker, *Don Davies,* Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, U. S. Office of Education
"School Improvement and Staff Development"

Friday, July 31
8:30 a.m. Session Chairman: James D. MacConnell, Professor of Education, Director, School Planning Laboratory, Stanford University
Speaker: *Ralph Tyler:* Director Emeritus, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, President, National Academy of Education
"Evaluation and Accountability in Relation to Educational Personnel"
Panel Members: Dolores Colburg—Montana; Byron Hansford—Colorado; Kenneth Madden—Delaware

10:30 a.m. Session Chairman: James D. MacConnell
Speaker: *Michael W. Kirst:* Assistant Professor of Education and Business Administration, Director, Joint Program in Educational Administration, Stanford University
"Political Orientations and Behavioral Patterns: Linkages between Teachers and Children"
Panel Members: Richard Wells—Indiana; James Sensenbaugh—Maryland

1:30 p.m. Session Chairman: William Smith, Director, Division of School Programs, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, Office of Education
Speaker: *Henry M. Levin:* Associate Professor of Education and Economics, and R&D Associate, SCRDT, Stanford University
"Teachers for Large-City Schools"
Panel Members: David Kurtzman—Pennsylvania; John Porter—Michigan

Monday, August 3

8:30 a.m. Session Chairman: H. Thomas James, Dean, School of Education, Stanford University
Speaker: *Luvern Cunningham:* Dean, College of Education, Ohio State University, on leave as Fellow, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavorial Sciences
"Establishment Types as Revolutionaries"
Panel Members: William C. Kahl—Wisconsin; Dale Parnell—Oregon; Leonard DeLayo—New Mexico

10:30 a.m. Session Chairman: J. Victor Baldridge, Assistant Professor of Education, and R&D Associate, SCRDT, Stanford University
Speaker: *Hugh Scott:* Project Administrator, Neighborhood Education Center, Detroit, Michigan
"The NEC Project: Its Implications for the Design, Implementation, and Assessment of Programs of Compensatory Education"
Panel Members: Howard Casmey—Minnesota; Franklin Quitugua—Guam

1:30 p.m. Session Chairman: J. Victor Baldridge
Speaker: *John Bremer:* Director, Parkway Program, Philadelphia

"The Parkway Program"
Panel Members: Paul Johnston—Iowa; Craig Phillips—North Carolina

Tuesday, August 4

8:30 a.m. Session Chairman: Lesley Browder, Lecturer, School of Education, Stanford University
Speakers: *Carl E. Thoresen:* Associate Professor of Education, and R&D Associate, SCRDT, Stanford University; *Ted Alper:* Post-doctoral Fellow, Stanford Institute for Behavioral Counseling
"Developing Personally Competent Teachers: A Behavioral View"

10:30 a.m. Session Chairman: Lesley Browder
Speaker: *Robert H. Koff:* Assistant Professor of Education, R&D Associate, SCRDT, and Director, Stanford Teacher Education Program (STEP), Stanford University
"Crisis in Content in Teacher Education"
Panel Members: Gordon Diedtrich—South Dakota; William Robinson—Rhode Island

1:30 p.m. Session Chairman: Lesley Browder
Speaker: *James Werntz:* Director, Center for Curriculum Studies, University of Minnesota
"School Curriculum Development: A Mechanism for Development of Educational Professionals"
Panel Members: Weldon Shofstall—Arizona; Cliff Hartman—Alaska

Wednesday, August 5

8:30 a.m. Session Chairman: Richard C. Atkinson, Professor of Psychology and Education, Chairman, Department of Psychology, Stanford University
Speakers: *John O. Bolvin:* Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh, and Mrs. *Betty Robinson:* Pittsburgh Public Schools
"The Effects of Technology on the Functions of School Personnel"

1:30 p.m. Session Chairman: Al Lilywhite, Assistant to Executive Secretary, Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D. C.

Speaker: *Patrick Suppes:* Professor of Statistics, Education, and Philosophy, Director, Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences, Stanford University
"Computer-Assisted Instruction in the Schools"
Panel Members: Francis Castles—Canal Zone; Garvin Johnston—Mississippi; C. Taylor Whittier—Kansas

Thursday, August 6

8:30 a.m. Session Chairman: Dustin Wilson, Acting Director, Teacher Leadership Development Branch, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, USOE
Speaker: *Frank B. W. Hawkinshire:* Assistant Professor of Education, and R&D Associate, SCRDT, Stanford University
"Social Interactions in the Supervision Process"

10:30 a.m. Session Chairman: Dustin Wilson
Speaker: *Leon Lessinger:* Calloway Professor of Education, Georgia State University
"An Introduction to Performance Contracting: What Chief State School Officers Should Know"
Panel Members: Martin Essex—Ohio; Newell Paire—New Hampshire

Friday, August 7

8:30 a.m. Session Chairman: William R. Odell, Professor of Education, Stanford University
Speaker: *N. L. Gage:* Acting Director, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Professor of Education and Psychology, Stanford University
"The D in Educational R&D at the Stanford Center in 1970"
Panel Members: Louis Bruno—Washington; M. F. Peterson—North Dakota

10:30 a.m. Session Chairman: William R. Odell
Speaker: *Paul Woodring:* Education Editor-at-Large, *Saturday Review,* Distinguished Service Professor, Western Washington State College
"Conference Summary"

Appendix C

EVALUATION FORM[1]

Educational Personnel Conference for Chief State School Officers
Palo Alto, California, July 30-August 7, 1970

1. Please rate the presentations listed below in terms of their contribution to your thinking in the area of personnel development. Check one for each presentation.

	This presentation contributed:			
	Very Much	Much	Little	None
a. Tyler—Evaluation and Accountability in Relation to Educational Personnel	.....	.....	.....	.....
b. Kirst—Political Orientations and Behavior Patterns: Linkages between Teachers and Children	.....	.....	.....	.....
c. Levin—Teachers for Large-City Schools	.....	.....	.....	.....
d. Cunningham—Establishment Types as Revolutionaries	.....	.....	.....	.....
e. Scott—The NEC Project: Its Implications for Design, Implementation, and Assessment of Programs of Compensatory Education	.....	.....	.....	.....
f. Bremer—The Parkway Program	.....	.....	.....	.....

[1]For Items 2-9, only the questions are presented here. The actual questionnaire provided space for answers.

g. Thoresen—Developing Personally Competent Teachers: A Behavioral View ....
h. Koff—Crisis in Content in Teacher Education ....
i. Werntz—School Curriculum Development: A Mechanism for Development of Educational Professionals ....
j. Bolvin and Robinson—The Effects of Technology on the Functions of School Personnel ....
k. Suppes—Computer-Assisted Instruction in the Schools ....
l. Hawkinshire—Social Interactions in in the Supervision Process ....
m. Lessinger—An Introduction to Performance Contracting: What Chief State School Officers Should Know ....
n. Gage—The D in Educational R&D at the Stanford Center in 1970 ....
o. Davies—School Improvement and Staff Development ....

2. The various presentations focused on several major themes relating to personnel development, e.g., technology, evaluation, accountability, teacher training, etc.
   a. Which *of these* themes would you most like to have explored more fully in future conferences?
   b. Which topics *not included* in this year's conference would you most want to have added to the agenda of future meetings?
3. The conference has provided a considerable amount of informative input.
   a. What high priority items would you like to introduce in your state?
   b. Which do you see as most possible to introduce, given the restraints of the practical situation?
   c. How, if at all, will you be able to utilize this information in effecting needed changes in your state?
   d. What kind of training and technical assistance do you need from universities, regional labs, local school systems, the USOE, and other institutions in order to implement innovations?

4. As a rule the daily format of the conference included:
   Three presentations, each involving
   a. a speaker,
   b. reaction by panel members, and
   c. discussion from the floor.

   Do you think these arrangements were effective? (Yes, No)
   What modifications or alternatives do you think would improve the conference format?
5. On most days an informal evening session was held. Would you like to have them continued at future conferences of this type? (Yes; No; Comment)
6. The conference ran from Thursday, July 30-Friday, August 7. Do you feel this was a reasonable length of time?
   If the duration of future conferences should be altered, how many *working* days should be scheduled?
7. We would appreciate your comments and suggestions for improvement on the manner in which each of the following arrangements were handled:
   a. Pre-conference communication and planning with the Chiefs
   b. Transportation
   c. Lodging
   d. Meals
   e. Reimbursement procedures
   f. Other
8. For several days a succession of speakers has related to you what they see as some of the most crucial issues and the greatest deficiencies in the states' policies and practices. Since education is a two-way process, what do you suggest, from your unique vantage points as Chief State School Officers, which would help these individuals in correcting shortcomings in their views in order that they might contribute more effectively to the educational scene?
9. What did you like best about the conference?

☆ GPO 980-615